

## REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1-21 and 27-29 have been rejected and claims 22-26 have been objected to. No claims have been amended.

### Drawings

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner required the submission of formal drawings. Proposed formal drawings are attached hereto. Entry of these formal drawings and withdrawal of the drawing requirement are requested.

### Claims

Claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-21, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Renner (WO 01/82190 A1). Claims 11 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Renner in view of Lambert (US 6,193,153). Finally, claims 22-26 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but as containing allowable subject matter. These rejections and objection are respectfully traversed.

#### *Renner*

Renner discloses a multi-tiered identity verification system for e-commerce including an identity authority that is interconnected between a user and a web site e-commerce provider. The identity authority includes identity verification software scripts that validate authorization data provided from the user. The user is provided with a validation kit installed on the user's computer terminal. The validation kit includes a browser with identity verification functions and a smart card reader and/or a biometric reader interconnected with the browser. In response to a verification demand from the e-commerce web site, the user's browser prompts the user to provide verification data from either the smart card reader or the biometric scanner and this data is provided to the identity authority for authorization. If the user is authorized, a verification code is provided to the user for transmission to the web site.

Renner notes at page 2, lines 1-4, and at page 11, lines 1-5, that verifications at different levels are contemplated. For example, a smart card may be used for simple log-in to a web site while biometric information is required to complete a purchase over a threshold dollar amount.

#### *Claims 1-12*

Claim 1 relates to a method of authorizing a user to communicate with a workstation supporting a plurality of authorization methods. The claimed method automatically determines the available user entry devices in communication with the workstation. For example, the workstation may support a smart card reader, a token reader, a retinal scanner, a fingerprint scanner, and a voice print scanner, but not all of these user entry devices may be available to the user. The first step is to determine the available user entry devices. Once the available user entry devices have been determined, the claimed method determines the user authorization methods supported by data from the available user entry devices. The user authorization information from the available user entry devices is then used to register the user against stored data for authorizing the user.

Such a method is not contemplated by Renner. Renner provides known input devices and does not perform the step of "automatically determining at least an available user information entry device in communication with the workstation." On the contrary, the verification script in the identity authority of Renner instructs the browser to prompt the user to provide identity data of a particular type. Hence, the Renner system provides only specific, predetermined identity verification methods and does not check to see which user authorization methods are supported by the user device as claimed. Accordingly, Renner does not anticipate the method of claim 1 or any of the claims dependent thereon.

*Claims 13-20*

Claim 13 relates to a method of authorizing a user to communicate with a workstation supporting a plurality of authorization methods. The claimed method provides a plurality of user authorization methods having different security levels associated with each user authorization method. Based on user authorization information provided to the workstation, the supported authorization methods are determined that require data only from the user authorization information provided. The user is then authorized to access the workstation at the level of security corresponding to the authorization methods that may perform the authorization with the provided information. For example, as noted with respect to Figure 4, a user working from the office may provide biometric information that permits access to low, medium, or high security level information, while the same user working from home may not have the biometric scanner and thus provide a token that permits access to only low or medium security level information. Similarly, the same user on the road may only have the

ability to provide a password that permits access to only low security level information.

Such a method is not contemplated by Renner. Renner does not determine from the supported user authorization methods the authorization method requiring data only from the provided authorization method and then registering the user with the associated level of security. On the contrary, the verification script in the identity authority of Renner instructs the browser to prompt the user to provide identity data of a particular type at a particular security level. Hence, the Renner system provides only specific, predetermined identity verification methods and does not check to see which user authorization methods and security levels may register the provided user authorization information as claimed. Accordingly, Renner does not anticipate the method of claim 13 or any of the claims dependent thereon.

*Claims 21-29*

Claim 21 relates to a method of authorizing a user to communicate with a workstation supporting a plurality of authorization methods. The claimed method provides a plurality of user authorization methods where some authorization methods require user authorization information from more than one data input device. The provided user authorization information is registered against data stored in the user authorization database and a security level is determined based on the degree of the match of the provided authorization information. The user is then authorized to access information within limits determined by the determined security level. In other words, the claimed invention supports the user authentication methods alone or in combination to provide different levels of security.

Such a method is not contemplated by Renner. Renner does not teach that some user authorization methods require user authorization information from more than one data input device to determine the level of security. Renner's teachings that verifications may be requested at more than one security level falls far short of suggesting the combination of user authorization information from more than one data input device as claimed. Accordingly, Renner does not anticipate the method of claim 21 or any of the claims dependent thereon.

*Lambert*

With respect to claims 11 and 15, the Examiner alleges that Lambert teaches prompting an individual to provide authorization information at intervals. Applicant submits that Lambert does not teach or suggest the shortcomings in Renner noted above with respect to independent claims 1 and 13; accordingly, the teachings of Lambert are not believed to be

DOCKET NO.: IVPH-0042/12-50 US  
Application No.: 09/625,548  
Office Action Dated: April 20, 2005

PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116

particularly relevant to the invention of independent claims 1 and 13 from which claims 11 and 15 respectively depend. Claims 11 and 15 are thus believed to be allowable for the same reasons as given above with respect to independent claims 1 and 13, respectively.

*Allowable claims 22-26*


Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 22-26 contain allowable subject matter. However, in view of the above, Applicant submits that independent claim 21, from which claims 22-26 depend, is allowable as well. Accordingly, Applicant has not placed claims 22-26 into independent form. Applicant reserves the right to place claims 22-26 in independent form at a later time as appropriate.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-21, and 27-29 as allegedly being anticipated by Renner and claims 11 and 15 as allegedly being obvious over Renner in view of Lambert is respectfully requested.

The present response is believed to obviate all rejections and objections of record. Withdrawal of the Final Rejection and issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully requested.

Date: October 20, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael P. Dunnam  
Registration No. 32,611

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439